

Mrs. Maloney for, with Mr. Foley against.

Mr. TEJEDA changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. FLAKE changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LINDER). The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 305, nays 101, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 638]

YEAS—305

Ackerman	Diaz-Balart	Johnson, E.B.
Allard	Dickey	Johnson, Sam
Andrews	Dixon	Johnson (SD)
Archer	Dooley	Jones
Army	Doolittle	Kaptur
Bachus	Dornan	Kasich
Baesler	Doyle	Kelly
Baker (CA)	Dreier	Kennedy (RI)
Baker (LA)	Duncan	Kim
Baldacci	Dunn	King
Ballenger	Edwards	Kingston
Barcia	Ehlers	Klecza
Barr	Ehrlich	Klug
Barrett (NE)	Emerson	Knollenberg
Barrett (WI)	English	Kolbe
Bartlett	Ensign	LaHood
Barton	Eshoo	Largent
Bass	Everett	Latham
Bateman	Ewing	LaTourette
Bentsen	Farr	Laughlin
Bereuter	Fawell	Lazio
Bevill	Fields (TX)	Leach
Bilbray	Flake	Lewis (CA)
Bilirakis	Flanagan	Lewis (KY)
Bliley	Forbes	Lightfoot
Blute	Ford (TN)	Linder
Boehkert	Fowler	Lipinski
Boehner	Fox	Livingston
Bonilla	Frank (MA)	LoBiondo
Bono	Franks (CT)	Lofgren
Borski	Franks (NJ)	Longley
Boucher	Frelinghuysen	Lucas
Brewster	Frisa	Luther
Brown (OH)	Funderburk	Manton
Brownback	Furse	Manzullo
Bryant (TN)	Gallely	Martini
Bunn	Ganske	Mascara
Bunning	Gekas	McCarthy
Burr	Gilchrest	McCollum
Burton	Gillmor	McCreary
Buyer	Gilman	McHale
Callahan	Goodlatte	McHugh
Calvert	Goodling	McInnis
Camp	Goss	McIntosh
Canady	Graham	McKeon
Castle	Greenwood	McNulty
Chabot	Gunderson	Meehan
Chambliss	Gutknecht	Menendez
Chapman	Hall (OH)	Metcalf
Chenoweth	Hamilton	Meyers
Christensen	Hancock	Mica
Chrysler	Hansen	Miller (FL)
Clayton	Hastert	Mineta
Clement	Hastings (WA)	Minge
Clinger	Hayes	Mink
Coble	Hayworth	Molinari
Coburn	Hefley	Montgomery
Collins (GA)	Heineman	Moorhead
Combest	Herger	Murtha
Cooley	Hilleary	Myers
Costello	Hobson	Myrick
Cox	Hoekstra	Neal
Crane	Hoke	Nethercutt
Crapo	Holden	Neumann
Creameans	Horn	Ney
Cubin	Hostettler	Norwood
Cunningham	Houghton	Nussle
Danner	Hunter	Ortiz
Davis	Hutchinson	Orton
de la Garza	Hyde	Oxley
Deal	Inglis	Packard
DeFazio	Istook	Pallone
DeLay	Jackson-Lee	Parker
Deutsch	Johnson (CT)	Paxon

Payne (VA)	Schiff	Thornberry
Peterson (MN)	Schumer	Tiahrt
Petri	Seastrand	Torkildsen
Pombo	Sensenbrenner	Torricelli
Porter	Shadegg	Towns
Portman	Shaw	Trafficant
Poshard	Shays	Upton
Pryce	Shuster	Visclosky
Quillen	Skeen	Vucanovich
Quinn	Skelton	Walker
Radanovich	Smith (MI)	Walsh
Ramstad	Smith (TX)	Wamp
Rangel	Smith (WA)	Waters
Reed	Solomon	Watts (OK)
Regula	Souder	Weldon (FL)
Rivers	Spence	Weldon (PA)
Roberts	Spratt	Weller
Roemer	Stearns	White
Rogers	Stockman	Whitfield
Rohrabacher	Stump	Wicker
Ros-Lehtinen	Stupak	Wise
Roth	Talent	Wolf
Roukema	Tate	Woolsey
Royce	Tauzin	Wyden
Salmon	Taylor (MS)	Young (AK)
Saxton	Taylor (NC)	Zeliff
Scarborough	Tejeda	Zimmer
Schaefer	Thomas	

NAYS—101

Abercrombie	Green	Pelosi
Becerra	Gutierrez	Peterson (FL)
Beilenson	Hall (TX)	Pickett
Berman	Harman	Pomeroy
Bonior	Hastings (FL)	Rahall
Browder	Hefner	Richardson
Brown (CA)	Hilliard	Rose
Bryant (TX)	Hinchev	Roybal-Allard
Clay	Jacobs	Rush
Clyburn	Jefferson	Sanders
Coleman	Johnston	Sanford
Collins (IL)	Kanjorski	Sawyer
Collins (MI)	Kennedy (MA)	Schroeder
Condit	Kennelly	Scott
Conyers	Kildee	Skaggs
Coyne	Klink	Slaughter
Cramer	LaFalce	Stark
DeLauro	Lantos	Stenholm
Dellums	Levin	Stokes
Dingell	Lewis (GA)	Studds
Doggett	Lowe	Tanner
Durbin	Markey	Thompson
Engel	Martinez	Thornton
Evans	Matsui	Thurman
Fazio	McDermott	Torres
Fields (LA)	Meek	Velázquez
Filner	Miller (CA)	Vento
Foglietta	Moran	Volkmer
Frost	Nadler	Watt (NC)
Gephard	Obey	Ward
Gibbons	Olver	Williams
Gonzalez	Owens	Wynn
Gordon	Pastor	Yates
	Payne (NJ)	

NOT VOTING—28

Bishop	McDade	Serrano
Brown (FL)	McKinney	Sisisky
Cardin	Mfume	Smith (NJ)
Dicks	Moakley	Tucker
Fattah	Mollohan	Waldholtz
Foley	Morella	Waxman
Geren	Oberstar	Wilson
Hoyer	Reynolds	Young (FL)
Lincoln	Riggs	
Maloney	Sabo	

□ 1825

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mrs. Waldholtz for, with Ms. McKinney against.

Mr. PALLONE changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNUAL REPORT ON FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEES 1994—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHAMBLISS) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight:

To the Congress of the United States:

As provided by the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended (Public Law 92-463; 5 U.S.C. App. 2, 6(c)), I am submitting my second Annual Report on Federal Advisory Committees covering fiscal year 1994.

This report highlights continuing efforts by my Administration to reduce and manage Federal advisory committees. Since the issuance of Executive Order No. 12838, as one of my first acts as President, we have reduced the overall number of discretionary advisory committees by 335 to achieve a net total of 466 chartered groups by the end of fiscal year 1994. This reflects a net reduction of 42 percent over the 801 discretionary committees in existence at the beginning of my Administration—substantially exceeding the one-third target required by the Executive order.

In addition, agencies have taken steps to enhance their management and oversight of advisory committees to ensure these committees get down to the public's business, complete it, and then go out of business. I am also pleased to report that the total aggregate cost of supporting advisory committees, including the 429 specifically mandated by the Congress, has been reduced by \$10.5 million or by over 7 percent.

On October 5, 1994, my Administration instituted a permanent process for conducting an annual comprehensive review of all advisory committees through Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-135, "Management of Federal Advisory Committees." Under this planning process, agencies are required to review all advisory committees, terminate those no longer necessary, and plan for any future committee needs.

On July 21, 1994, my Administration forwarded for your consideration a proposal to eliminate 31 statutory advisory committees that were no longer necessary. The proposal, introduced by then Chairman GLENN of the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs as S. 2463, outlined an additional \$2.4 million in annual savings possible through the termination of these statutory committees. I urge the Congress to pursue this legislation—adding to it if possible—and to also follow our example by instituting a review process for statutory advisory committees to ensure they are performing a necessary mission and have not outlived their usefulness.

My Administration also supports changes to the Federal Advisory Committee Act to facilitate communications between Federal, State, local, and tribal governments. These changes are needed to support this Administration's efforts to expand the role of these stakeholders in governmental policy deliberations. We believe these actions will help promote better communications and consensus building in a less adversarial environment.

I am also directing the Administrator of General Services to undertake a review of possible actions to more thoroughly involve the Nation's citizens in the development of Federal decisions affecting their lives. This review should focus on the value of citizen involvement as an essential element of our efforts to reinvent Government, as a strategic resource that must be maximized, and as an integral part of our democratic heritage. This effort may result in a legislative proposal to promote citizen participation at all levels of government consistent with the great challenges confronting us.

We continue to stand ready to work with the Congress to assure the appropriate use of advisory committees and to achieve the purposes for which this law was enacted.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 6, 1995.*

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES OF THE U.S. GOVERNMENT IN UNITED NATIONS, 1994—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit herewith a report of the activities of the United States Government in the United Nations and its affiliated agencies during the calendar year 1994. The report is required by the United Nations Participation Act (Public Law 264, 79th Congress; 22 U.S.C. 278b).

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 6, 1995.*

□ 1830

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHAMBLISS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

JUDGE HENRY WOODS AND THE WHITEWATER CASE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, about 4 or 5 weeks ago I took a special order talking about a judge in Arkansas, in Little Rock, a Federal judge who has close political ties to the current Governor, Jim Guy Tucker, and President Clinton, and particularly the First Lady, Hillary Rodham Clinton. Judge Henry Woods has been a long-time political adviser to the President and to Mrs. Clinton. He has appointed her to a number of boards. He recently was given a case involving the current Governor, Jim Guy Tucker, which was brought to his attention and put before his court by Mr. Starr, who is investigating the Whitewater matter and other related matters.

At that time, when I had my special order, I suggested that in order to eliminate any appearance of impropriety, Judge Henry Woods should recuse himself and not be the judge to hear this case, because no matter what he did, if he rendered a decision in favor of Mr. Tucker, Governor Tucker, it would have the appearance of impropriety.

One of the other judges down there in a related case dealing with Webb Hubbell, who was indicated and convicted, you remember Webb Hubbell, he was the Assistant Attorney General appointed by President Clinton, did recuse himself. He did it because he felt like the appearance of impropriety was something that should not even be considered by a Federal judge.

I urged during my special order that Judge Henry Woods recuse himself, as the other Federal judge did in a related case, but Judge Henry Woods did not do that. This week it was announced that he dismissed one of the indictable offenses against Governor Jim Guy Tucker, and it certainly does give the appearance of impropriety because of this connection with Jim Guy Tucker and the people who are currently residing in the White House, as well as other Democrat leaders throughout Arkansas.

Tonight I would like to submit for the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, all of the information I have regarding Judge Henry Woods, my previous special order, an article that was written by a person from Little Rock who served in the Arkansas State Senate with Judge Henry Woods when he was in the Senate, and I would like for all of these articles to be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so at some future date, if Judge Henry Woods renders decisions that are of concern to Members of the House, there will be a record in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to say to all who are on the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight that we ought to have a complete and thorough hearing on the Whitewater case and all the related cases, including the one currently pending before the courts involving Jim Guy Tucker, the Governor of Arkansas, I think there is so much that appears to be col-

lusion down there that it boggles the mind. For Judge Henry Woods to participate and render the decision he did last week regarding Jim Guy Tucker is just beyond comprehension.

As a matter of fact, I would like to just read one thing that was said in the newspaper article which I think was put in the paper today. "It's typical hometown anger at the Feds coming in," says James Madison University political science professor Robert Roberts. "But if it hadn't been for Federal prosecutors, the level of scandal at the local and State level would be 10 times greater than it is today," Roberts predicted. This is the part I want to put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In particular, "Roberts predicted Starr would win on appeal," that is the decision by Judge Henry Woods he is going to appeal, that "Roberts predicted Starr would win on appeal because of the long tradition of granting independent counsels widespread discretion. This is nothing for President Clinton to cheer about," says Roberts. "He is best served by letting the investigation run its course quickly, and this just delays things."

I submit to my colleagues here in the House that the reason for this delay is because of the close personal relationship Judge Henry Woods has with First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton and other people in the Jim Guy Tucker administration. It is unfortunate this happened. It should not have happened. He should have recused himself.

The material referred to follows:

[From the USA TODAY]

INDEPENDENT COUNSEL CHALLENGED

(By Tony Mauro)

A Little Rock federal judge's decision Tuesday to dismiss fraud indictment against Arkansas Gov. Jim Guy Tucker marks the first time the broad powers of an independent counsel have been trimmed.

U.S. District Judge Henry Woods said Whitewater independent counsel Kenneth Starr overstepped his authority in June by indicting Tucker of fraud charges related to a federal loan to finance a cable TV venture.

Starr contends the judge has no authority to rule on the scope of the investigation, which was launched to look into irregularities relating to the Whitewater real estate venture in which President Clinton and Hillary Rodham Clinton were partners.

"I cannot accept the proposition that . . . no court has the power to determine where there is jurisdiction to proceed in the matter," wrote Woods, a 1979 Carter appointee.

Starr promptly announced he would seek an expedited review by a federal appeals court in St. Louis.

Tucker still faces an 11-count indictment stemming from dealings with Madison Guaranty Savings & Loan, which was owned by the Clintons' Whitewater partners, James and Susan McDougal. They also have been indicted.

The ruling comes amid debate over the power of independent counsels, a hybrid breed of prosecutors created by a post-Watergate federal law in 1978.

Independent counsels are appointed by a three-judge panel at the request of the attorney general when a high-level official is suspected of violating federal law.

Originally viewed as properly insulated from political influence, critics now say